

ADDRESS *of*

WILLIAM D. MELTON

of COLUMBIA, S. C.

President of the South Carolina
Bar Association

DELIVERED IN THE HALL OF THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, IN THE CITY OF COLUM-
BIA, ON THE 27TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1921.

OUR COUNTRY
ITS FOUNDATIONS, ITS PROBLEMS AND ITS FUTURE



ADDRESS *of*

WILLIAM D. MELTON
of COLUMBIA, S. C.

President of the South Carolina
Bar Association

DELIVERED IN THE HALL OF THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, IN THE CITY OF COLUM-
BIA, ON THE 27TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1921.



"But what is liberty without wisdom, and without virtue? It is the greatest of all possible evils; for it is folly, vice and madness, without tuition or restraint."—BURKE.

JK213
M5

By Transfer
JUN 1 1921



Address

I am going to speak to you of our country—its foundations, its problems and its future.

The wisest teacher who ever taught, in concluding the most wonderful discourse ever heard by man, urged his hearers to build their houses upon rocks. The former Campanile that stood in the Square of St. Mark's in Venice, a tower of great strength and architectural symmetry and beauty, the pride of the Venetians, fell because its foundations were laid in the sand; and great was its fall. The national monument in Washington, built of granite and of stones contributed by the various States of the Union, the highest monument of its kind in the world, has withstood the weather and storms of years and stands today as it will ever continue to stand throughout all time—grand, beautiful, majestic, emblematic in its strength and firmness of our great country—because its foundations are built and imbedded deeply in cement and stone. The wise and prudent mariner, caught in a rough and angry sea, looks back to the point whence he began his voyage in order that he may with certainty guide his craft into a haven of safety. And so I am going to take you back to the foundations of our government, to the point whence we started, in order that we may more clearly see our way in these times of stress and strain.

It was on Friday, the 25th day of May, 1787, that the convention which framed our Constitution met in the State House in the City of Philadelphia, the same house, though not the same hall, in which the Declaration of Independence had been adopted eleven years before. George III was still on the throne of England. Louis XVI was King of France. Catherine, the Great, was Empress of Russia. Joseph II was Emperor of Austria. Frederick the Great had been dead barely a year. Napoleon Bonaparte was an obscure young

lieutenant of artillery in the French Army. The fires of the French Revolution were burning, almost ready to burst into flames and fury and horror. Our Revolution had been successfully ended and peace had been made with Great Britain. The individual State governments were proving fairly satisfactory, but the Union was not functioning properly.

The convention was composed of distinguished men in every way equipped for the work in hand. They were all men of learning and experience, great intellectually and morally, and altogether competent for the making of the constitution of a great nation, as time has proved. Character, courage and patriotism were predominant, distinguishing and common characteristics among them. George Washington, then fifty-five years of age, was a deputy from Virginia and President of the convention. "No nobler name ever stood in the forefront of a nation's life." Edmund Randolph, then Governor, James Madison, afterwards President, George Wythe and George Mason were also deputies from Virginia. Patrick Henry was also elected but declined to serve. When asked why, he is reported to have said, "I smel't a rat." Our forefathers had the same "nigger in the woodpile" that we have today. South Carolina had four deputies, namely, John Rutledge, then approaching fifty years of age, Charles Pinckney, then twenty-nine, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, his cousin, nearly ten years older, and Pierce Butler, about forty-five years of age. The convention also numbered among its members Alexander Hamilton of New York, described as "one of the smallest men physically and one of the biggest intellectually," Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, whose "crippled arm and wooden leg might detract from his personal appearance but could not suppress his spirit," James Wilson, also of Pennsylvania, John Dickinson of Delaware, Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut, Robert Morris, of New York, and many other distinguished men. Benjamin Franklin was added as a Pennsylvania deputy but at eighty-one years of age his powers were failing. Neither John Adams nor Thomas Jefferson were members of the convention. John Adams was then Minister to England and Thomas Jefferson, Minister to France. The average age of the members was forty-two, and although one-sixth of their number were foreign born, most of them had played important parts in the drama of the Revolution. The

Puritans were there from Plymouth Rock and Massachusetts Bay, the Dutch from New Amsterdam, the Swedes from Delaware, the Quakers from Pennsylvania, the Cavaliers from Virginia and South Carolina, and the Scotch-Irish from Pennsylvania and the Carolinas—all the nations which had contributed to the melting pot of America were there in the persons of their representatives. There were Puritans and Quakers and Presbyterians and Huguenots and Catholics, all contributing their best thought and ideas. No assembly of men could have been more representative and complete. When Thomas Jefferson heard the names of the members in Paris he wrote to John Adams, who was then in London: "It really is an assembly of demi-gods." And this is the verdict of posterity.

Guided by the principles of liberty and justice, and their own experiences, inspired by the writings of Montesquieu and Rousseau whose books were very much read at the time, but without precedent or analogy—for there was neither precedent nor analogy in the history of Greece or Rome, or feudal Europe—these great men, our forefathers, went faithfully to work at their task. Madison asserted and Hamilton repeated after him that "they were now to decide forever the fate of Republican government;" and Gouverneur Morris said, "The whole human race will be affected by the proceedings of this convention."

Hamilton wanted a strong centralized government somewhat similar to a monarchy. Madison and the Virginia delegates wanted a democratic government. Three plans were submitted to the convention: The Virginia plan, principally the work of Madison, was presented by Governor Randolph of Virginia; a second plan was presented by Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, and a third, the New Jersey plan, was presented by the deputies from New Jersey. The debate was long and at times acrimonious. Washington, who presided, but took no part in the debate, growing apprehensive of the result, at one time expressed himself thus:

"It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another conflict is to be sustained. If to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

And so the event proved. Almost at the moment when Edmund Burke was writing that "human institutions must grow unconsciously and cannot be constructed," our forefathers were framing a constitution and laying the foundations of a government which has proved the most stable and successful in history. Although fresh from the blood and carnage of the Revolution they laid no desecrating hands upon the rights and liberties of their fellow-men, and builded their constitution upon the principles and precepts of fraternity and equality before the law. In the product of their thoughts and deliberations they combined with their learning and experience all that was good in the past and all that was good in the various peoples who had commingled in the making of America. From their own traditions and laws and customs; from the principles of the Declaration of Independence; from the English Revolution and the Bill of Rights; from the Magna Charta and the rights wrung from King John at Runnymede; from the writings of Montesquieu and Rousseau; from the laws of Greece and Rome; from the inquisitions and persecutions of Europe; from the blood of the martyrs and the light of the reformation; from the teachings of the Scriptures; from the sorrow and suffering of mankind everywhere in every land and clime: they perfected the foundation of our government and cemented it with human hearts and human souls; and upon it they raised a standard like unto that standard raised on Golgotha, by God Himself, nearly two thousand years ago, a standard of liberty and righteousness and justice and truth.

Mr. Gladstone said of it that just "as the British Constitution is the most subtle organism which has proceeded from progressive history, so the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man;" and Ex-President Taft, very recently in speaking of the guaranties provided in the Constitution for the liberty of our citizens and the protection of their property, expressed "firm faith that it is built to weather all storms and will survive the present era of unrest," and sees in the Constitution "a guaranty of future progress and the extension and perpetuation of Christian civilization."

Yet the people were by no means unanimous either as to its adoption by the convention or its ratification by the States.

It was referred to as a "bundle of compromises," and so it was, but compromises of the right sort; and John Quincy Adams referred to it as having been "extorted from the grinding necessity of a reluctant nation." In South Carolina ratification was bitterly and vigorously opposed by Rawlins Lowndes, who is reported to have said in closing the debate "that he saw dangers in the proposed government so great that he could wish, when dead, for no other epitaph than this: 'Here lies the man that opposed the Constitution because it was ruinous to the liberty of America'." It is also said that he lived to find this epitaph a false prophecy.

There are some today who refer to the Constitution as antiquated and out of date. I read an editorial in a recent issue of the *New York World*, in which it is referred to as an "ox-cart undertaking to do the work of an automobile truck." No one has ever claimed that it was of divine origin or absolutely perfect. It has never been within the power of human beings at a single sweep of the eye to foresee all the contingencies of the future. Soon after its ratification it became necessary to amend it by adding the Bill of Rights as the first amendment. In all, nineteen amendments have been made, and it can and must be amended again from time to time to meet the exigencies of progress. It is a practical constitution made for practical purposes. Others complain that it has been misinterpreted and misconstrued by the courts; and so it has been, and so it will ever continue to be misinterpreted and misconstrued as long as it is human to err. But it has stood the test of time for nearly one hundred and thirty-four years (since 17 September, 1787), and stands today as the great bulwark of our liberties.

There is a tradition that when Thomas Jefferson returned to the United States a year or so after the adoption of the Constitution he protested to Washington against the establishment of two houses in the legislative branch. The incident is said to have occurred while the two were at breakfast, and Washington asked Jefferson, "Why did you pour that coffee into your saucer?" "To cool it," replied Jefferson. "Even so," said Washington, "we pour legislation into the senatorial saucer to cool it." I wondered when reading this incident whether Jefferson also ate his rice with a knife.

Dry leaves of history, all this, some of you may say, and yet out of these dry leaves, laden with frankincense and myrrh

and spices, there has risen like the phoenix of Heliopolis, the greatest government and the greatest nation the world has ever known.

Since the adoption of the Constitution our life as a people has been a life of long continued and ever increasing prosperity and of comparative peace and happiness. While other nations have been rent and torn by wars and revolutions our afflictions of this sort have been few. The war of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War can hardly be dignified by the name of wars. They were but ripples on the bosom of a placid sea; but our War Between the States arising from the construction of the rights of the States under this same Constitution rent us almost in twain. Valuing our peace and happiness we were slow to take part in the World War. Some of us knew from the beginning that we must take part and were impatient at the delay; but the great mass of the people had to be educated and convinced that righteousness and justice and truth were being attacked and that the liberty of the entire human race was at stake. We were never "too proud to fight," never afraid, and now that we can contemplate this great war in the retrospect, how glorious is the thought that in that moment of supreme tragedy our country and our people almost to the man rose sublime and esteemed it a privilege and an honor to contribute our treasure and our lives for the preservation of the principles upon which we had built and maintained our nation.

And in this great cataclysm of the nations of the earth, South Carolina played her part and played it bravely and well. Though one of the smallest States, South Carolina, contributed 53,482 men, or 1.42 per cent. of the men enlisted; and it is worthy of note that of the 52 Congressional Medals awarded for the highest degree of coolness and bravery, the most highly prized of all the medals, six of these medals, or twelve per cent. of the entire number awarded, went to South Carolinians. No other State received more than three. There were South Carolinians at Chateau-Thierry, there were South Carolinians at Belleau Wood and in the Argonne, and there were South Carolinians in great numbers in the Thirtieth Division when it broke the Hindenburg line.

But it is not a part of my purpose to discuss the great war. Our arms were victorious. The armistice came at the eleventh

hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month of the year, 1918. Millions of men and women gave their lives to the cause. Peace to their ashes! Millions in greater numbers, maimed and wounded, will carry their scars and wounds to the end of their days. Millions in still great numbers, numbers almost inconceivable, gave their time and service, some for months and some for years, disrupting their social, domestic and business relations. And now just as the greatest of all wars is ended so it has left in its wake the greatest problems the world has ever known, governmental, political, financial, social, domestic, industrial, moral, religious. It is of some of these problems, in so far as they concern our country, that I wish to speak.

The problem fraught with the most imminent danger to our peace and well-being lies in the spirit of unrest that seems to have taken possession of people everywhere. There were symptoms of this uneasiness before the war. Society was not satisfied with things as they had been. The classical and melodious music of Beethoven and Mendelssohn, of Wagner and Mozart, had to give way to rag-time and the music of the jazz-band; the stately minuet and graceful waltz had to be supplanted by the camel-walk, the bunny-hug and the cheek-dance; the drama of Shakespeare and Moliere and Goethe had to give way to the moving picture show with its blood and thunder and thrills, and vaudeville with its indecent exposures and vulgar wit; the poor were becoming more and more envious of the rich, and more and more dissatisfied with their lot; labor and capital were at each others throats; strikes and lockouts were prevalent everywhere, even in public utilities; human rights were no longer respected and human life was becoming cheap; crime was open and rampant; even our system of government was under attack; and the whole world seemed out of joint. This spirit was in the workshop, in the office, in the factory, on the farm, in the home, in the air—everywhere. The war did not improve, it rather exaggerated these conditions. This spirit of the age manifested itself in various ways and took unto itself various forms and names. Some called it anarchy, some communism, in some parts of the United States it was called Syndicalism and the I. W. W., and in Russia, where it is most prevalent and has been most harmful and destructive, it took and bears the name of Bolshevism.

Let us for a moment examine this monster of iniquity, this arch-enemy of liberty and democracy. It has been briefly described by Lenine as the "dictatorship of the proletariat," which in plainer language means the arbitrary government and oppression of the best and most enlightened classes of society by its lowest and most ignorant class. It is in no sense democratic, for it requires a very strong centralized power and government to sustain it. Marx, upon whose teachings it is said to have been founded, ended his famous manifesto to the workmen of the world by saying "that they had nothing to lose through revolution except their chains," and Lenine, the Russian dictator, has asserted time and again that it must and can only work out its ideals through carnage and bloody revolution. The word bolsheviki, means majority and yet in Russia where alone it is in practical operation, according to Lenine's own statement, one hundred and eighty millions of people are dominated by two hundred thousand "proletarians and poorest peasants"; for mark you not all peasants but only the poorest peasants are allowed to vote. The right of suffrage is denied to the bourgeoisie, whose destruction as a class the Bolsheviki hope to bring about. Only a few of those who work with their hands and the poorest peasants are allowed to vote. This great privilege is denied to "every merchant, from the keeper of a corner grocery store to the owner of a great mercantile establishment; every banker, every commission agent, every broker, every insurance agent, every real estate dealer, every farmer, or peasant, who hires help of any kind, even a single hand; every petty contractor, garage keeper, or other person employing any kind of hired help whatever, including the professional writer who hires a stenographer, the doctor who hires a chauffeur, and the dentist who hires a mechanic or assistant; every clergyman and minister of the Gospel; every person whose income is derived from inherited wealth or from invested earnings, including all who live upon annuities provided by gift or bequest; every person engaged in housekeeping for persons included in any of the foregoing, including the wives of such persons; all persons engaged in occupations which a competent tribunal decided to classify as non-essential and non-productive;" and to a great host of others too numerous to classify or mention. The right of suffrage is limited principally to the "poorest peasantry" and wage earners who work with their hands without hired help.

All others having the right must be engaged in public service of some sort. The right of property is absolutely abolished and so is money, the medium of exchange. The sacred ties of family and home are not recognized. Children are the wards of the State. Freedom of speech is suppressed. In the Pravda, their official organ, not long ago there appeared this statement: "The press is a most dangerous weapon in the hands of our enemies. We will tear it from them and we will reduce it to impotence * * * * We are going to smite the journals with fines, to shut them up, to arrest the editors, and hold them as hostages." In one of his proclamations Lenine says: "The present is the period for the destruction and crushing of the capitalistic system of the whole world. * * * * The new apparatus of government must express the dictatorship of the working class." And so on, *ad nauseam*.

I need not tell you that in that land of unlimited man power, fifty-five per cent. of man power is lacking in the national industries; that production has decreased eighty per cent., and that sixty per cent. of the production is taken for the armies; nor need I tell you of the vast amount of poverty and suffering and misery which now afflicts that country so abundant in undeveloped wealth and so full of great possibilities. The Bolsheviks have surpassed the Romanovs in the exercise of despotic power and in cruel and pitiless oppression.

Some will say Bolshevism is a failure in Russia and there is no longer any danger to us. You can make no greater mistake. Lenine and Trotsky are still in the saddle and some of the nations, unwisely as I think, are undertaking to establish trade relations with them. Others say it will never spread beyond Russia, but even if it does it can never find friendly soil in free America. Do you remember the great fire in Chicago some years ago, how it started from a lamp being kicked over by a cow in a shed and how it spread until the entire city was in ruins? Have you ever visualized a prairie fire—how it starts from a spark in some remote corner and how the conflagration spreads until it covers hundreds of acres and destroys everything in its path? Do you recall how the influenza, starting from a microbe in Spain some years ago, covered the habitable earth and sent millions of men and women to their graves? These are familiar illustrations of how Bolshevism will spread if given the opportunity. Indeed the baleful spread of Bolshevism needs no illustration. Dur-

ing the war the Germans let Lenine and Trotsky loose upon the Russian army, with their Bolshevist propaganda, and the money to spread it, and the morale of that army, which for years had resisted shot and shell and charge and counter-charge, melted before it like mist before the rising sun. It sounds well and good to say that Bolshevism can never flourish in free America. It is here already. It is coming in through Mexico. It is coming in through the immigrants who are arriving daily by the thousand. You will find it in the bomb that was exploded in Wall Street some months ago. You will find it in the sabotage that is being wrought by the Syndicalists and I. W. W. throughout the country and especially in the West. You will find it in the crime wave unprecedented in daring and boldness that has spread over this country within the last year. The robber and the thief no longer find it necessary to use stealth and burglary to accomplish their ends but boldly hold up their victims in the crowded thoroughfares of the city in broad daylight, help themselves and escape. You will find it in a great many labor unions and other organizations; and you will find it in the votes of over a million of our people who, in the last election, voted for Eugene V. Debs, a self-confessed convict, for President of the United States. There seems to be something seductive and fascinating about it to the laboring man, and to the ignorant and uninformed, something that attracts them to it. It is like the serpent which first charms and then devours its prey. To them

“It is a monster with such frightful mien,
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with its face,
They first endure, then pity, then embrace.”

Another problem which at this time is threatening and disturbing our peace is the problem of immigration. We have now in our midst something like twenty millions of foreign born, nearly one-fifth of our entire population, more than half of whom can neither read, write nor speak our language. A great many of them are responsible for the disturbances now so prevalent in the mining regions of the country; but they are scattered here and there all over the country, grouping themselves mainly in the larger cities, in the industrial centers and in the agricultural sections of the West. Unused to liberty,

obsessed and imbued with the ideas and tenets of the countries whence they came on account of persecution, oppression and intolerable conditions of one sort and another, they are the source of everlasting discontent and disorder. My idea is that these people ought to be educated and converted to our ideals if possible, and compelled to swear allegiance to our country and become citizens, or leave. We have "room about our hearth for all mankind," for the persecuted and oppressed of every nation everywhere, but we want no hyphenated Americans.

But the end of the war has brought to us a new phase of the problem of the immigrant. We can, let us hope, by education and deportation deal satisfactorily with those who are here. It is those who wish to come that are now causing alarm. It is reported that more than fifteen millions are now ready and eagerly awaiting the means of transportation to come to America. This number may be and probably is an exaggeration, but the fact remains that the number of those wishing to come runs into the millions and that there are many more than our country needs or can assimilate or accommodate. It is of some consolation to reflect that there are not ships enough to bring so large a number within the next several years. This fact was demonstrated during the war in the effort to rush the American troops to European ports. With the general public denied the right of passage and all possible bottoms made available we were more than a year transporting two million troops using every particle of space possible for that purpose.

What shall be the policy of the United States? Shall we deny them admittance to our shores for a term of years, or shall we restrict them? To deny admittance would not be in accordance with the policy of our free institutions, a policy which we have pursued and under which we have grown and prospered for more than a hundred years. It would be the policy of China, the policy of a dying civilization, the policy of stagnation and ultimate decay. It is said that Edmund Burke when a young man contemplated coming to America, and that Cromwell and Hampden as young men were actually on board ship for the purpose of coming and settling here. Carnegie, the great philanthropist, was an immigrant from Scotland; and so I might continue through a long list. We might deny admittance to some such men as these. Besides

we need some immigrants. We need the fresh infusion of blood that the immigration of the best in Europe affords, and at this time we can have the best if we will. We need immigrants on the farms, in the mines, and for the labor and drudgery which Americans will not do. You can't get the American to do common labor on the farms, to dig in the mines, or to do the common drudgery of thousands of different sorts. In the South we use the negro for these purposes for the most part, but in the North and West where negroes are scarce it is absolutely necessary to use the immigrant. To deny admittance altogether, even for a limited time, therefore, is to stop the wheels of orderly work and progress. The solution lies in limiting the number to our needs and imposing the restrictions necessary to keep out the vicious and undesirable; and to enforce the laws rigidly in these respects. There never was any excuse for the admission of Trotsky, or of Emma Goldman, or of Martens, the self-styled Soviet Ambassador, or of de Valera, or of the new Mayor of Cork, who has just arrived to disturb our tranquility and peace.

A question which concerns us greatly, as much perhaps as any other, is the labor problem. The laboring classes are so dissatisfied that they have become fertile fields for the work of anarchists, communists and the like. Strikes, lockouts, sabotage, the destruction of private property and the denial of private rights are but some of the manifestations of this distemper. The innocent third party, the general public, is either ignored or given scant consideration. There was a time when capital despoiled labor, but now the boot is on the other foot, for it is labor that is now undertaking to despoil capital. Who controls your street cars and railroads and mines and other public utilities—the stockholders and the bondholders, or the workmen? The United Mine Workers have declared that “the whole product of the mine belongs to the miners, and that those who contributed capital for its development should receive nothing,” and this is typical of the attitude of many of the workers in public utilities. I am sincere in my desire to see that the workingman gets his share and his full share of the profits produced by him, and I am sincere in my belief that he has not always gotten all that belongs to him. To the laborer belongs and justly belongs a fair share of the product of his hands; but that does not mean

that capital is not also entitled to its share. In this world of many men and many minds and many kinds of people the policy of all should be to deal fairly and squarely with their fellow-men and live and let live. The "square deal" for all makes for human happiness. If disputes arise let them be solved, not by arbitrary and unreasonable demands, but by full and fair and temperate discussion.

Capital in the mind of the average laboring man has come to be a word of opprobrium and contempt, a vile and venomous thing to be eschewed and spit upon and cast away. Yet capital is but the combined wealth of all sorts of people, the poor, the widow and the orphan, the lame, the sick and the blind, of all those who cannot strive and labor, as well as of the indolent and rich and affluent. Capital and labor are twin brothers who should rise together with the morning sun, work together while there is yet daylight, and at evening lie down together in green pastures in love and harmony and peace.

The first general strike recorded in history occurred nearly five hundred years before Christ when the plebeians of Rome retired to Mons Sacer and Menenius Agrippa prevailed upon them to return by relating his fable of the belly and its members. The hands and arms said they were tired of working and striving for the lazy, trifling, luxury-loving belly; the eyes said they were tired looking out for it and the legs and feet that they were tired of carrying it about; all the members revolted and seemed ready to throw the belly into the trash heap and desert it, until, taking counsel with the mind, they realized that the belly was after all the source and reservoir of all their strength and activity and life. And so it is with capital—it is labor's reservoir.

I rejoice in the fact that capital and labor seem to be coming to a better understanding and that an enlightened and strong public sentiment against strikes is showing a decided tendency toward the readjustment and settlement of their differences on principles of reason and justice in place of the arbitrary demands of labor leaders and professional agitators. I rejoice also in the decided tendency toward schemes of profit sharing as preventing differences which might otherwise arise. Labor organizations are necessary and desirable, but their members should not get their minds so full of the "motion is carried" and the like, as to make them forget the teachings of Him who said, "Thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself."

There are two classes of people in our country who are intent on making trouble, the one with our neighboring country on the south, and the other with our neighboring country on the north. One of these classes is composed of people who have made investments in oil and other properties in Mexico which they wish to improve and exploit, and out of which they hope to make tremendous fortunes. To the end that they may be protected in their work and that their dreams of untold wealth may be realized propaganda has been and is being generally and vigorously circulated, urging intervention on the grounds that American lives are being ruthlessly taken and that the property of American citizens is being illegally and unjustly confiscated; and that in any event the United States should intervene and take over the government of Mexico in the interest of the advancement of civilization. Greed and the desire to make money, the true motives for this propaganda, are kept in the background. A mere statement of the facts must stamp the cause of this class of our people with injustice and condemn it. We want to be friendly with Mexico because she is our neighbor and because she is the nearest of the Spanish-American nations protected by our Monroe Doctrine—a doctrine which the South American republics have been encouraged to view with grave suspicion as to its sincerity. A false step in the case of Mexico would everlastingly condemn us with them. Mexico, however, seems at this time to be working out her own salvation.

The other class is composed of the “Friends of Irish Freedom,” as they call themselves, urged on by the organization known as the Sinn Fein in the interest of the Independence of Ireland. Sinn Fein means “we, ourselves,” and recalls to one’s mind the most selfish man in the world whose only prayer was “Oh Lord, bless me and my wife, and my son, John, and his wife, us four and no more.” From the extent of the propaganda and the amount of noise made by these “Friends of Irish Freedom” one would think the Irish one of the most numerous peoples of the earth. As a matter of fact Ireland has a population of a little over four million people, less in number than the States of North and South Carolina, and very much less than the single City of New York. Ireland was never a nation. From the time she emerged from tribal chaos she became and has since continued to be associated with

England and a part of Great Britain, as for her own security and happiness she ought to be. True she has always been the querulous member of the family and for the greater part of the time she has been disloyal, regarding England's extremity as Ireland's opportunity. In this respect I have considered Sinn Feinism as worse than Bolshevism—it has something of Absalom, something of Benedict Arnold, something of Judas Iscariot in it. The object and purpose of the present agitation is by working on the ancient grudge, or grudges, which so many of our people have against Great Britain, to obtain recognition of Ireland as an independent nation and to that end to create a breach and disturb our present friendly relations to such an extent as ultimately to engage our active cooperation and support.

If there were no other reason for denying our cooperation to the Sinn Feiners it would be a sufficient answer to say "it is none of our business." I once knew a man who made a fortune by attending to his own business. Besides Ireland does not need independence of Great Britain. Ireland with independence of Great Britain would be like the little dog that runs barking and yelping after a locomotive—she wouldn't know what to do with it if she got it. And Ireland does not really want independence of Great Britain. The thrifty, industrious, most enlightened and most stable part of Ireland, the Ulsterites, are open in their opposition to it, and the majority of the Irish people are not in sympathy with the demands or policies of the Sinn Feiners.

Ireland is at this time the most prosperous country in Europe because of her lukewarm and tardy participation in the war, and has more freedom and more representation in government than any country on the face of the earth. It is noteworthy that Ireland with her four millions of population returns forty-eight more members to Parliament than the County of London with its population of approximately eight millions. The officials in Ireland are Irish almost to a man, and would probably be Irish absolutely to a man but for the refusal of a great many Irish to accept office. There are more Irish officials in Great Britain than there are English in Ireland. With a Welsh Prime Minister and a Scotch-Irish leader of the House, it is absurd for the Irish to assert that the government of Great Britain is altogether English. I was struck with the truth in the statement of a little actress

whom I saw and heard recently in a play in one of the New York theatres, that "The only contented Irishman she ever saw was a dead one."

A few months ago the Union Club, composed of American citizens, most of them old men as I am told, in celebrating the centenary of the arrival of the Pilgrims, used as decorations the flags of America, of France and of Great Britain. The "Friends of Irish Freedom" became enraged at the use of the British flag, undertook to tear it down by force, stoned the club, broke its windows and assaulted its members; and a priest in undertaking to quiet the mob and restore order had the effrontery to refer to America as "Greater Ireland." The Irish will have their joke. The population of Ulster in their own chief city during the war had to listen to the Sinn Feiners rejoicing over German victories, and yet free American born citizens in their own land could not use the flag of one of their allies as a decoration. And it has perhaps not been forgotten that during the war these same "Friends of Irish Freedom" assaulted and stoned American soldiers in Cork and Queenstown because they had gone over there to fight Germany.

Great Britain is our mother country and our friend and ally. We are one in blood, one in family, one in language and religion, one in traditions and laws, and one in our ideals of human liberty and human rights. We have had our family quarrels, at times we have used harsh words towards each other, and on two occasions we have come to blows; but nevertheless we have proven fast friends. Yet there are many among us who have shown a disposition to nurse our ancient grudges to keep them warm. Other nations and peoples jealous of our prosperity and envious and apprehensive of our power have with singular persistency seized upon this predisposition to keep the old wounds open and sore and if possible put us at each other's throats. Historians, even our own historians, have not all been fair to England. Some have not had the knowledge, some not the ability, and some, I dare say, not the desire to correct the evil propaganda that has been circulated. We have been told that before our Revolution, England overtaxed, oppressed and sought to enslave us, and during the Revolution sought to destroy and annihilate us, but we were not always told that George III was a German and demented, had a fake and pocket parliament, that the sympathy of such

Englishmen as Walpole and Pitt and Burke and Fox and of the English people generally was with us, that the English would not volunteer to fight the Americans, and that George III had to hire 30,000 Hessians, who were also Germans, to do the fighting for him. We were told that in the war of 1812 England preyed upon our commerce and illegally impressed our sailors and seamen for her own service, how we beat the English at New Orleans, on Lake Erie and on the high seas, and how when the English captured Washington they burnt it like a lot of vandals; but we were not told that our "General Hull began by invading Canada from Detroit and surrendered his whole army without firing a shot, that the British overran Michigan, and parts of Ohio and Western New York, while we retreated," and that we ourselves had burned Toronto the year before the British burned Washington. We were told how President Monroe commanded the British and the whole of Europe to keep their hands off of American territory and of how all of them obeyed, but we were not told of the pernicious doctrine and threatening attitude of the Holy Alliance as enunciated in the Articles written by Metternich, the Austrian Prime Minister, which sought the destruction of all democratic and representative governments, and that as a counter thereto the Monroe doctrine was suggested by George Canning, the British Prime Minister, to President Monroe, who promulgated it after consultation with Jefferson, then in retirement, and that it has had the support of the British navy from that day to this.

In order by contrast to emphasize our grievances we were told of the valiant and heroic services of the French, of Lafayette and Rochambeau and de Grasse, but we were told little of the fact that France needed us as badly as we needed the French, and we were told little or nothing of the fact that directly after the Revolution the King of France was more hostile to us than England, or of how the French pirates a little later in 1797 and 1798 preyed upon our commerce, or of the conduct of Citizen Genet, envoy of the French Republic, whose recall Washington had to request. Nor were we told of the subsequent hostility of Napoleon and Talleyrand. I have no patience with the man who says now or said during the war "I love the French, but I am against the English." If such a man is not ignorant of history, or prejudiced, scrape

his skin and you will find German blood in his veins; and this will to a large extent account for his sentiments.

I would not do the Irish the least injustice. I am myself of Scotch-Irish descent and am very proud of it. Nor would I take the least of credit or honor from the French for the assistance rendered by them in securing our independence and freedom. I have always loved the French and have always felt deeply grateful to them. No incident of history has touched me more than when General Pershing standing at the grave of Lafayette bared and bowed his head and said "Lafayette, we have come"—words that will go down in history. He expressed the sentiment of every true American. For once in the history of the world a debt of gratitude has been paid. But I stand for a square deal for England, our mother country, our faithful friend and ally. (Great applause.) England has been fair in her disputes with us as to boundaries and fisheries, she stood by us in the Venezuela dispute, she stood by us in Manila Bay, and she will stand by us again if the occasion arises. Think of what would have happened to us and to the world if the British fleet had gone down at Jutland or Scapa Flow.

And yet strange as it may seem our country over-zealous in guarding the right of free speech permits and has for months permitted Eamon de Valera, President of the so-called Irish Republic, to come to this country and go from one end of it to the other spreading his pernicious propaganda and collecting millions of dollars for the furtherance of Sinn Feinism against England; permits the widow and brothers and sister of the late Mayor of Cork to do the same thing; and even permits the present Mayor of Cork, O'Callaghan, for the same purpose to violate our immigration laws and come in as a stowaway without a passport. The authorities, it is true, are now telling O'Callaghan to return to Ireland, but that is very much like locking the stable after the horse is stolen. More than this, our country is now permitting a commission of one hundred, known as the Villard Commission, composed almost entirely of Irish-Americans and persons sympathetic with and committed to the cause of the Sinn Feiners to organize and hold its sittings in Washington, our capitol, for the avowed purpose of investigating Irish conditions, but for the real purpose of circulating and spreading their propaganda among our people. What would you think if the British were to al-

low a similar commission to organize and meet near White Hall, or the Houses of Parliament, in London, to investigate conditions in Hawaii, or to inquire into the justice of our protectorate over Cuba?

In London some years ago I was examining the books in an old book store on Fleet street when a curious looking volume attracted my attention. I bought it and upon reading it I found its contents more curious still. It embraced the relation of two traditions. One is that the Coronation Stone of Great Britain, which for centuries has been a part of the Coronation Chair which you see in Westminster Abbey is the stone upon which Jacob rested his head when he had his dream, and that the present King of Great Britain is a direct descendant of the Kings of Israel. The stone is said to have been carried to Spain by a daughter of Zedekiah, the last of the Kings of Judah, accompanied by the prophet Jeremiah and others, and thence by them to Ireland, and thence by one of the Scottish chiefs to Scotland, where it became the Coronation Stone of the Kings of Scotland; and thence by King Edward I to London, where it became the Coronation Stone of the King of England. Every British King and Queen since Edward I, except the Roman Catholic Queen, known in history as "Bloody Mary," has been crowned upon that stone. The other tradition, more marvelous still, if that be possible, is that the lost tribes of Israel, who failed to cross the river Jordan, immigrated across the continent of Europe to England and became the ancestors and forbears of the Anglo-Saxon race. I have no faith in either of these traditions, but I take delight in the belief that as the children of Israel were the chosen people of God, so the two great Anglo-Saxon nations, Great Britain and America, are the nations chosen by God to establish throughout the earth the sacred principles of our free governments, of our civilization and of our religion.

I have already obtruded too much on your time and patience and yet there are numerous other problems that deeply concern our well being. The inequality of wealth and opportunity, the existence of so great a number of swollen fortunes, the excess-profits tax and other unjust systems of taxation, the extent of unemployment and idleness, the superabundance of crime, the drift from the country to the cities and the problem of the farmers, illiteracy and the poor, the Japanese ques-

tion and the negro problem—the last a problem which we of the South must always carry—the problem of two races impossible of amalgamation or of social equality living side by side, under the same government, a problem, however, which we are perfectly competent to solve if left alone.

The times indeed are full of problems. What are the remedies. They are three, discipline, education and religion. It is possible we need more laws, but it is certain that we need a better enforcement of the laws we have. Our percentage of illiteracy and lack of education is appalling and fraught with the gravest dangers; and yet our teachers are not paid salaries enough to afford a decent livelihood for themselves and their families. No taxation levied for educational purposes is too high. South Carolina has next to the highest percentage of illiteracy among the States of the United States, and yet we levy nearly the smallest percentage of taxes to relieve this condition. Schools and teachers, however, are not the only means of education. The press, newspapers and magazines, are potent influences; and statistics show that more than fifteen millions of our citizenship daily attend the theatres and moving picture shows. It is by the proper use of these means that the masses must be educated—all these with the churches must be made the weapons of truth.

As you pass into the vestibule of the great Lenox Library on Fifth Avenue, in the City of New York, you will see chiseled in gold on the right column of the entrance to the ante-room these words: "On the infusion of education among the people rest the preservation and perpetuation of our free institutions." Never was truth more surely written.

It is related that two great financiers were standing on the bridge watching the great falls of the Niagara as the water rolled from the lake into the gorge nearly two hundred feet below, when one said to the other: "This is the greatest undeveloped power in the world." "Not so," said the other reflecting, "the greatest undeveloped power in the world is the human soul."

Mr. Roger W. Babson in his book on the Fundamentals of Prosperity relates that when he was a guest of the President of the Argentine Republic, one day after lunch sitting in the sun parlor looking over the river the President asked, reflectively, "Mr. Babson, I have been wondering why South Amer-

ica with all its great natural advantages is so far behind North America notwithstanding South America was settled before North America." Mr. Babson, being a guest, said: "Mr. President, what do you think is the reason?" The President replied, "I have come to this conclusion: South America was settled by the Spanish who came to South America in search of gold, but North America was settled by the Pilgrim Fathers who went there in search of God."

In the Scotch Presbyterian Church on Fifth Avenue in the City of New York, I heard the distinguished Scotch pastor tell this incident in concluding a masterly sermon. He said that on one occasion when crossing the Atlantic becoming restless late one night he went out on the promenade of the steamer to walk and meditate. He met another passenger, an Ex-President of the United States, who happened to be doing the same thing, and the two began to talk of things that matter. Finally the Ex-President said, "What the world needs is an Emperor." The Scotch preacher was astonished—think of it, here was a great American statesman, an Ex-President of the greatest Republic the world has ever known, seriously saying that the world needed an Emperor—but the Ex-President continued, "What the world needs is an Emperor and his name is Jesus Christ."

Writing Utopias and Altrurias, systems of ideal states, has been from time immemorial fine intellectual and psychological exercise and entertainment. More than four hundred years before Christ, nearly twenty-five hundred years ago, Plato, of whom Eusebius so beautifully observed, "He alone of all the Greeks reached to the vestibule of truth, and stood upon its threshold," gave to the world through dialogues with Socrates his ideal Republic as the rule of an aristocracy composed of the wisest and best—the very reverse of Bolshevism. Plato said there could be no ideal state until kings are philosophers and philosophers kings. Early in the sixteenth century Sir Thomas More, Lord High Chancellor of England, a "lover of liberty, justice, truth and toleration," gave to the world his Utopia, described as the greatest literary production of his time. Early in the next century Lord Bacon, also Lord High Chancellor of England, described by Pope as the "wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind," published his New Atlantis. Some years afterwards in the same century Campanella, the

Dominican Monk, notwithstanding his seven years of confinement in fifty different prisons, during which he was tortured 20 times, found diversion in writing and publishing his *City of the Sun*. In the eighteenth century Rousseau, sickly, morbid, passionate, ungrateful, immoral, hypocritical and infamous as he was, yet said to be "the greatest literary genius of his age," found recreation and delight in writing and publishing his dream of an ideal government in his *Social Contract*, said to have been the text-book and inspiration of the French Revolution; and Socialists of today are still at work in the endeavor to conceive and construct an ideal state and hand it over ready-made as a boon to mankind.

All these works and others of like kind have proved to be fascinating to the mind but impossible of practical application. They provide for existence but not for life. God Almighty never intended that all men should be equal and that they should live together like ants and bees as though controlled by instinct. He gave man a mind and soul, with wants and desires, aspirations, hopes and varying strength and energy and ability. He put in man the desire to work and acquire and accumulate; and He expected him to receive and enjoy rewards in proportion to the exercise of his talents. In the parable of the talents as related in the Gospel the master said to the servant to whom he had given five talents, according to his ability, and who had made and brought other five talents, "Well done thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy lord." And to the servant to whom he had given one talent, according to his ability, and who had hid his talent and returned it only to his lord, he said, "Thou wicked and slothful servant. Take the talent from him and give it unto him that hath ten talents; and cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

I deeply deplore the existence and number of swollen fortunes in our country. It seems impossible for any man to acquire hundreds of millions by fair means, or by the fair exercise of his talents. The foundation of such huge fortunes must have depended upon corruption or the accidents of chance. They are a menace to our well being and some means should be devised of limiting and distributing them.

“Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.”

And yet, if you were to put all the wealth of the world in a pile and divide it equally among mankind that condition would not continue for a single day.

The government of the United States is a practical government intended for practical purposes. For years it has been used as a model by peoples all over the world seeking to form new governments, and after the war the peoples of Europe clamored to learn of it. Some months ago I heard a great Baptist minister speak in the opera house in Columbia. He said that after the war it had been his privilege to make a speaking tour over the stricken portions of Europe. He had gone over Bulgaria, Roumania, Servia, and even into Russia. He asked the people over there what they wanted him to talk about and everywhere came back the answer, “Tell us about your free government, its institutions, its constitution and its laws.”

The story is told by the Hon. John Barrett that while he was Minister to Siam he became very much attached to the heir to the throne then a youth in his teens and never let an opportunity pass to tell him of our wonderful land of freedom and her ideals. Siam, as you know, is an absolute monarchy and in a large part of it Buddhism is the prevailing religion. The royal family at the time of which I speak entertained a belief somewhat similar to the belief in the transmigration of souls. They believed that upon the death of a person something in him similar to the human soul passed from him to another human being, and so on and on until at last it passed into a perfect being, who having fulfilled all things and enjoyed all happiness ended that particular chain of lives. In the course of events the heir was taken sick and was told he had but a few moments to live. He asked to be permitted to speak to the American Minister alone. His wish was granted, and in a weak and dying voice he said, “Sir, if as I believe, I am to live again, pray for me as I pray for myself that I may become an American citizen.”

A few years ago Lord Bryce wrote that “the future of the United States during the next half century sometimes presents

itself as a struggle between two forces, the one beneficial, the other malign, the one striving to speed the nation to a port of safety before the time of trial arrives, the other to retard its progress so that the tempest may be upon it before the port is reached." The writer of a recent magazine writing of the present times says, "It is the kind of situation in which former civilizations have gone down." Lord Macauley predicted that the civilization of the United States would be destroyed by lawlessness engendered within her own institutions. Indeed "the shadows hang heavy on the hills." How long will our country endure? It is for all of us "to take up arms against a sea of troubles and by opposing end them." Even then how long will our civilization last? Other civilizations, ancient and modern, have gone down. How long is left for us? The Chaldean Empire collapsed before Cyrus, the Great, who established the Persian Empire. It had not lasted a century. The Persian Empire went down before Alexander the Great, who sighed for more worlds to conquer. It had lasted but two centuries. The empire of Alexander was barely established before his untimely death, whereupon it was divided among his generals. The Roman Empire held her sway for more than five centuries and then joined the procession of the ages and fell and disintegrated. The empire founded by that interesting and picturesque figure of world history, Peter the Great, lasted less than two and a half centuries. The German Empire apparently so strong and firm lasted less than half a century, because it was founded and owed its existence to militarism and the principle that might makes right. The Emperors of Russia, Germany, Austria, and China, are dead or in exile. Bourbons, Bonapartes, Romanovs, Hapsburgs, and Hohenzollerns, former kings, potentates and princes, bereft of their thrones, principalities and powers are wanderers on the face of the earth. Life in all its tragic incompleteness from the thatched roof of the peasant to the palace of the prince has been changed by the mighty cataclysm of war and social revolution, never again to recur to the conditions of former times. The curtain has fallen on a civilization from which it will nevermore be lifted. How long will the great republic of the United States endure? Who knows? I can only say:

"And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock."

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 027 119 810 3

Press of
MCCAUFEE OF COLUMBIA
COLUMBIA, S. C.

